REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37 and 39-43 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 28 and 35 being independent. Independent claims 1, 28 and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Favorable reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments of the Applicants, which are preceded by related comments of the Examiner in small bold type:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

2. Claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant.

Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al. teach all the limitations of the claims except for a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge. However, Deavila discloses an emergency station 20 having a portable fire extinguisher 102, a portable defibrillator located compartments 94c and 94d (see page 4, paragraph 0056). Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge 80 for detecting and displaying pressure condition within a volume of a tank 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Morgan et al. and Nishimoto et al. with a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge as suggested by Deavila and Avant respectively. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for remote inspection of emergency equipment. The equipment is installed at one or a system of emergency equipment stations. The apparatus includes a detector that is located at an emergency equipment station for detection of the presence of an obstruction to viewing of or access to the emergency equipment station. The detector includes a sonar module. The apparatus also includes a defibrillator station with a portable defibrillator and a fire extinguisher station with a portable fire extinguisher, both located at the emergency equipment station. The portable fire extinguisher includes a fire extinguisher gauge for detecting and displaying pressure conditions of fire extinguishing material

contained within a volume of a tank included in the portable fire extinguisher. The apparatus further includes an electronic circuit in communication between the detector and a remote central station. The electronic circuit can issue a signal to the remote central station upon detection of one or more selectable predetermined conditions including predetermined internal conditions and predetermined external conditions. The predetermined external conditions include removal of the portable fire extinguisher.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or suggest the features of amended independent claim 1. Morgan teaches a defibrillator system that uses multiple external defibrillators and a communication network. Nishimoto teaches an obstruction detecting apparatus. Deavila describes an emergency station that includes a portable fire extinguisher. Avant describes a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge for detecting and displaying pressure condition of a tank. None of Nishimoto, Morgan, Deavila, Avant, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests an electronic circuit that can issue a signal to a remote central station upon detection of one or more selectable predetermined conditions including predetermined internal conditions and predetermined external conditions, wherein the predetermined external conditions include removal of the portable fire extinguisher, as required by amended independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

The dependent claims 6-8, 18-21, 27 partake the novelty of their parent claim, amended claim 1. Therefore they are believed to be patentable.

Amended independent claim 28 includes subject matter that is similar to amended independent claim 1. As such, independent claim 28 is also believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons noted above.

The dependent claims 30-32 and 40-43 partake the novelty of their parent claim, claim 28. Therefore they are also believed to be patentable.

3. Claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant.

Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge. However, Deavila discloses an emergency station 20 having a portable fire extinguisher 102, a portable defibrillator located compartments 94c and 94d (see page 4, paragraph 0056). Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge 80 for detecting and displaying pressure condition within a volume of a tank 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Cronin et al. and Nishimoto et al. with a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge as suggested by Deavila and Avant respectively. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station.

Amended independent claim 35 is directed to an emergency equipment station comprising a portable defibrillator, a portable fire extinguisher, wherein the portable fire extinguisher includes a fire extinguisher gauge for detecting and displaying pressure conditions of fire extinguishing material contained within a volume of a tank included in the portable fire extinguisher, one or more batteries that supply power to the portable defibrillator or portable fire extinguisher, a detector for detection of a low battery condition, a detector for detection of the presence of an obstruction to viewing of or access to the portable defibrillator or portable fire extinguisher, and circuitry for transmitting a signal to a remote station upon detection of one or more selectable predetermined internal and predetermined external conditions. The predetermined external conditions include removal of the portable fire extinguisher.

Cronin is understood to teach a protective defibrillator storage device capable of issuing alarm signals, and Nishimoto is understood to teach an obstruction detecting apparatus. Deavila describes an emergency station that includes a portable fire extinguisher. Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge for detecting and displaying pressure condition of a tank. None of Nishimoto, Morgan, Deavila, Avant, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests circuitry for transmitting a signal to a remote station upon detection of one or more selectable predetermined internal conditions and predetermined external conditions, in which the predetermined external conditions include removal of the portable fire extinguisher.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 35 is believed to be patentable.

4. Claims 9, 10, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 above, and further in view of Rockwell et al.

The dependent claims 9, 10, and 22-25 partake the novelty of their parent claim, amended independent claim 1. Rockwell is not understood to remedy the forgoing deficiencies of Morgan, Nishimoto, Deavila and Avant. In particular, Rockwell does not disclose or suggest an electronic circuit that can issue a signal to a remote central station upon detection of one or more selectable predetermined conditions including predetermined internal conditions and predetermined external conditions, in which the predetermined external conditions include removal of a portable fire extinguisher.

For at least these reasons, the dependent claims 9, 10, and 22-25 are believed to be patentable.

5. Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 above, and further in view of Cronin et al.

The dependent claims 33 and 34 partake the novelty of their parent claim, amended independent claim 28. Cronin is not understood to remedy the forgoing deficiencies of Morgan, Nishimoto, Deavila and Avant. In particular, Cronin does not disclose or suggest a circuitry for transmitting a signal to a remote station upon detection of one or more selectable predetermined conditions including predetermined internal conditions and predetermined external conditions, in which the predetermined external conditions include removal of a portable fire extinguisher.

For at least these reasons, the dependent claims 33 and 34 are believed to be patentable.

7. Claims 36, 37, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of Morgan et al.

The dependent claims 36, 37, and 39 partake the novelty of their parent claim, amended claim 35. Morgan is not understood to remedy the forgoing deficiencies of Nishimoto, Deavila and Avant. In particular, Morgan is not understood to teach circuitry for transmitting a signal to a remote station upon detection of one or more selectable predetermined internal conditions and

predetermined external conditions, in which the predetermined external conditions include removal of a portable fire extinguisher.

For at least these reasons, dependent claims 36, 37, and 39 are believed to be patentable.

Double Patenting

9. Claims 1, 6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37, 39-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent No. 7,271,704 in view of Deavila and Avant.

Applicant is willing to file a terminal disclaimer to overcome the above double patenting rejection, upon the removal of the pending claim rejections.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 617-368-2191.

$60 for the required Petition for Extension of Time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account Authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 04373-033001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 18 April 2008

Jeffrey J. Barclay
Reg. No. 48,950

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin St.
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21888624.doc